

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-42 remain in this application. Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33, 34, 35, and 65, are being amended, and claims 39042 are being added. The claim amendments clarify the claim language and are not intended to limit the scope of the claims, unless the claim language is expressly quoted in the following remarks to distinguish over the cited art.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 9-12, 17-20, and 25-28, and 37-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wesinger Jr. et al. (USP 5,778,367) in view of Talati et al. (USP 5,903,878) and further in view of Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed and further in view of de l'Etraz et al (USP 6,073,138) and further in view of Yoshinaga (USP 5,962,829). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner correctly admits that Wesinger does not specifically disclose "sending an authentication email to the user, wherein a reply to said authentication email is required to complete said creation". In an attempt to overcome the deficiency of Wesinger, the Examiner relies on Talati in an attempt to show the step of "sending an authentication email to the user, wherein a reply to said authentication email is required to complete said creation".

The Examiner correctly admits that Wesinger does not specifically disclose "allowing the setting of privacy levels by the user for each said field, said setting

comprising selecting one of more than two privacy levels so that the user controls data shown in each said field to another user based upon the selected privacy level for each said field". In an attempt to overcome the deficiency of Wesinger, the Examiner relies on Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed in an attempt to show the step of "allowing the setting of privacy levels by the user for each said field, said setting comprising selecting one of more than two privacy levels so that the user controls data shown in each said field to another user based upon the selected privacy level for each said field".

The Examiner correctly admits that Wesinger does not specifically disclose "to export electronic business card data from said records to a file readable by a contact management program". In an attempt to overcome the deficiency of Wesinger, the Examiner relies on de l'Etraz in an attempt to show the step of "to export electronic business card data from said records to a file readable by a contact management program".

The Examiner correctly admits that Wesinger does not specifically disclose "allowing the user to indicate a location of the user prior to an expiration date". In an attempt to overcome the deficiency of Wesinger, the Examiner relies on Yoshinaga in an attempt to show the step of "allowing the user to indicate a location of the user prior to an expiration date".

Independent claim 1 distinguishes over the combination of Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga combination at least by reciting, a method including "*providing an electronic business card*

file Web site to a user; allowing the creation of an electronic business card file by the user using said Web site, said creation comprising: allowing the user to enter information into a plurality of fields in the electronic business card file; storing said information; and sending an authentication email to the user, wherein a reply to said authentication email is required to complete said creation; allowing the user to search for one or more records; allowing the user to view said records and to export electronic business card data from records in a private list of the user to a file readable by a contact management program, wherein another user associated with a record in the private list has extra privileges granted by the user; if said creation is completed, allowing the setting of privacy levels by the user for each said field, said setting comprising selecting one of more than two privacy levels so that the user controls data shown in each said field to another user based upon the selected privacy level for each said field, wherein the user can set the privacy level to Private, Semi-Private, or Public for each particular field in the electronic business card file; allowing the user to indicate a location of the user prior to an expiration date; and sending an electronic mail by the user to a recipient, wherein the electronic mail contains a signature hypertext link that permits the recipient to access the electronic business card file web site in order to create a new electronic business card file for the recipient and to access information in a permitted field of the electronic business card file of the user", and such recited features are not disclosed or suggested in

Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga, considered singly or in combination.

Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to modify Wesinger with Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga because the combination would require a substantial reconstruction and redesign of the elements disclosed in the primary reference. (See MPEP 2143.01). For example, there is no suggestion in the references on how to modify the elements in the Wesinger to perform the steps as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga combination do not suggest or disclose any interface circuitry, modules, systems, methods, and/or techniques that permit the elements disclosed in Wesinger to perform the steps as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the modification of Wesinger, as suggested in the Office Action, is improper.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga combination.

Various claims depend from claim 1 and are patentable over the Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga combination for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over the same combination. Each of these depended claims further distinguishes over the Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga combination by reciting additional features.

Independent claims 9, 17, 25, 33, 34, 35, and 36 are each patentable over the Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga combination at least for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over the same combination.

Accordingly, each of the claims 9, 17, 25, 33, 34, 35, and 36 is patentable over the Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga combination.

Various claims depend from one of claims 9, 17, 25, 33, 34, 35, and 36 and are patentable over the Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga combination for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over the same combination. Each of these dependent claims further distinguishes over the Wesinger, Talati, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, de l'Etraz, and Yoshinaga combination by reciting additional features.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In the Office Action, claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23, 24, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wesinger Jr. et al. (USP 5,778,367) as applied to claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 above, and further in view of Mehovic (USP 6,122,642). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As noted above, claims 1, 9, 15, and 25 are patentable over the cited references for various reasons. Claims 7,

8, 15, 16, 23, 24, 31, and 32 depend from one of the claims 1, 9, 15, and 25 are patentable over the combination of Wesinger and Mehovic for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 9, 17, or 25 is patentable over the same combination.

In the Office Action, claims 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wesinger Jr. et al. (USP 5,778,367) in view of Taliti and further in view of Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed and further in view of Mehovic. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As noted above, claims 1, 9, 15, and 25 are patentable over the cited references for various reasons. Similarly, claims 33-36 are patentable over the Wesinger, Taliti, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5 Unleashed, and Mehovic combination for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 9, 17, or 25 is patentable over the same combination.

New claims 39-42 are being added and recite features that are not disclosed in any of the cited references.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-42.

If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to the allowability of the claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically point out where such teachings may be found.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (805) 681-5078.

Date: September 2, 2003

Respectfully submitted,
James G. Douvikas, et al.

By: Arnold M. de Guzman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
DeGuzman & Associates, PC
Reg. No. 39,955
805.681.5078
805.681.5076 (FAX)

Please send correspondence to:

**IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400**

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence, including the enclosures identified herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below. If the Express Mail Mailing Number is filled in below, then this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.10.			
Signature:			
Typed or Printed Name:	Arnold M. de Guzman, Reg. No. 39,955	Date:	September 2, 2003
Express Mail Mailing Number (optional):			